

Evergreen East Hills Visioning Strategy Taskforce

Balancing the Equation Agreement – Group 4 – Version 1.0

Group 4 Members:

Allan Covington, Mike Hill, J. Manuel Herrera, Lou Kvitek, Mark Milioto, Dave Zenker
Facilitator: John Baty Scribe: Rebecca Flores

Group 4 reached tentative agreements on three of the seven elements of the Balancing the Equation Exercise. The remaining areas of disagreement are the number of units, industrial retention, CFD, and amenity package value. Each of the seven elements is discussed below in greater detail.

#Units/Traffic

There is no agreement on this item. The range of discussion is between 4,200 units and 5,200 units (without background units) 5,700 units (with or without background units).

The primary concern related to higher unit counts is overall erosion of quality of life due to higher number of people competing for infrastructure and amenities. The primary concern related to lower unit counts is the decreased amenities package.

Industrial Retention

There is no agreement on this item, however all agreed that retaining 320 acres of industrial would not be acceptable. Retaining 0 acres and retaining 50 acres were the closest to receiving agreement.

Retail

300,000 sq feet of retail is acceptable.

The details as to the location and type of retail would need to be determined in greater detail as part of the process.

Affordable Housing

20% affordable housing only on Arcadia was acceptable, with the understanding that the Evergreen Valley College site would voluntarily provide 40% of their units as affordable.

Community Facilities District (CFD)

There was no agreement on this item, however after the group discussion there was some interest in the proposal brought forward by Joe Head that would enable the CFD to not show up on homeowner's tax bills.

Schools

High School and 2 or 3 Elementary schools are acceptable, with the understanding that the high school solution or location may not necessarily occur on one of the opportunity sites.

Amenity Package Value

There was no agreement on this item.